

Remarks

1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the application is urged in view of the amendments above and comments which follow.
2. In the Office action, claim 20 was objected to because of informalities; claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, claims 1, 7-18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and claims 6, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Each of these objections/rejections is addressed as follows.

3. Amendments of claims.

In claim 1, the words "which can be reached by at least 80% of the pixels of the display" have been removed and at the end of the claim, the feature of claim 2 has been added.

Claim 2 is cancelled.

In claim 3, the words "the color co-ordinates of" have been inserted between "differ" and "the center of gravity". This amendment is based on the specification, page 13, lines 5-7.

In claim 4, the words "a line of gravity" are replaced by "a center of gravity line".

In claim 5, the words "a line of gravity" are replaced by "a center of gravity line" and the words "of the value of the color coordinates of a point located on the center of gravity line" replace "from the line of gravity" at the

end of the claim. This amendment is based on the specification, from page 12, line 30 to page 13, line 1.

In claim 20, the word “span” is replaced by “spanned”.

4. Claim objections.

In the Office Action, claim 20 was objected to because of informalities. Therefore, amended claim 20 has been corrected, as proposed in the Office Action.

5. Claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

In the Office Communication, claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

This rejection was based on the sentence: “which can be reached by at least 80% of the pixels of the display”, qualifying the virtual target primary color in claim 1. Without acquiescing to the Examiners’ objection, these words have been removed from the amended claim 1. Attention is drawn to the fact that by simple choice of the virtual target primaries, it is possible to extend substantially the gamut triangle with color areas which can still be reached by an increased number of pixels (see e.g. the hatched areas A1, A2 and A3 in Fig. 3). But, by “Determining, for each real primary color separately, a virtual target primary color which can be reached by at least 80% of the pixels of the display”, means what it says: at least 80% of the pixels of the display can reach the color of the selected virtual target primary color. It is the selected virtual target primaries that need to be reached by most (= at least 80%) of the pixels of the display, and NOT the colors inside the color gamut formed using the selected virtual target primary colors. It is to be noted that Fig. 3 and Fig. 4A respectively show color triangles of three and four pixels of a display (see page 7 lines 1-6). It is mentioned at several places throughout the description that an

actual display comprises much more than a few pixels, see for example page 9 line 20, the sentence bridging pages 11 and 12, and page 13 lines 12-13. Furthermore it is known by a person skilled in the art that a display easily comprises a few hundreds of thousands of pixels, even a few millions of pixels. Displays of 1M pixels, 3M pixels, 4M pixels or 6M pixels are not extraordinary displays.

The drawings, in particular Fig. 3 and Fig. 4A, are only given as examples. As can be easily understood by anyone, it is practically impossible to clearly show in a drawing color triangles corresponding to all pixels of a display, even if it is a small display only comprising a few hundreds of thousands of pixels. Already with four pixels it is not easy to clearly distinguish between the different color triangles shown. This case is illustrated in Fig. 4A, which indeed is not a representative example as it is impossible in this case to show that at least 80% but not all of the pixels can reach the selected virtual target color primary. However, a person skilled in the art, when seeing the drawings, in particular Fig. 3 and Fig. 4A, would understand what is meant.

Hence, it is submitted that there is no problem of enablement.

The rejection was also based on the use in claims 4 and 5 of the expression “a line of gravity”, which, according to the Examiner, is understood as a line of force, drawn from the center of gravity point in the direction of gravity acting in the direction of gravity. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, this expression has been corrected and changed in the more common expression “center of gravity line” (also known as C.O.G. line), which is a line going through the center of gravity.

After these modifications, Applicants now submit that the amended set of claims meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

6. Claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In the Office Action, claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The wording of claims 3 and 5 has been amended and it is now clear that by a 20% difference or deviation is meant that the color coordinates of the virtual target primary color can deviate up to 20% from the color coordinates corresponding to the center of gravity point or from the color coordinates of a point on the center of gravity line.

In this way, the claim language is set forth in better English and the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph are met.

7. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(a).

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7-18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Booth, Jr. et al. (US 2003/0043088). Reconsideration is requested.

In amended claim 1, the feature of original claim 2 relating to the center of gravity has been introduced. As is clear from the Office Action, determining the color co-ordinates of a virtual target primary color on the basis of the determination of a center of gravity of a cloud formed by the color co-ordinates of the corresponding real primary colors of all pixels is not disclosed in Booth.

Amended claim 1 is thus not anticipated by Booth.

Because there is also no indication of such a feature or a hint pointing at such a feature in Booth or in any of the other cited references, amended claim 1 is also non-obvious in view of the prior art.

The same comments apply to claims 7-18 and 21, which are novel and non-obvious.

8. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

In the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Kojima et al. (US 6,313,806) and claims 19 and 20 were rejected over Booth in view of Othsuka et al. (US 2003/0003544).


Claims 6, 19 and 20 depend on amended claim 1 and are thus also submitted to be novel and non-obvious.

9. Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is requested.

April 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.

Reg. No. 26,935

Barnes & Thornburg LLP

One North Wacker Drive

Suite 4400

Chicago, Illinois 60606-2833

(312) 357-1313

(312) 759-5646 Fax